Case No. 12400-062 Client Ref. No. DP05786US

II. Amendments to the Drawings

Replacement sheet 3 of 3 of the drawings, which includes changes to Figure 3, is attached.

Specifically, Figure 3 was amended for illustrative purposes only to show the gas deflector 24 having two opposed terminal regions 25 and 26 with internal diameters being substantially the same as the external diameter of the cylindrical gas cylinder 20. Support for this amendment may be found in Applicants' application at paragraph [0028] and thus, no new matter has been added by this amendment. The amendment to Figure 3 was in response to an objection that Figure 3 failed to show the inner diameter of the deflector being the same as the outer diameter of the ends of the gas generator since an inaccurate gap is shown in Figure 3. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the amendment to Figure 3 has cured the respective objection.

III. Remarks

Claims 1, 4-8 and 11-12 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 8 and 11-12 have been rejected and claims 4 and 6-7 are objected to. The present amendment cancels claims 1, and amends claims 4-5, 8 and 11-12 to more particularly point out and clarify Applicants' invention. After this amendment, claims 4-8 and 11-12 will be pending.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the present amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 5, 8 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,536,041 issued to Acker et al. ("Acker '041") in view of U.S. Patent 6,349,964 to Acker et al. ("Acker '964"). Claim 1 has been cancelled by the present amendment and therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is now moot. Claims 5, 8, 11-12 stand rejected.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4 and 6-7 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have rewritten claim 4 in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 1. Claims 6-7 depend from claim 4 and are allowable therewith.

Claims 5, 8 and 11-12 have been rewritten to depend from claim 4 and are allowable therewith.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentable distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 13, 2009 /Daniel P. Dailey/

Daniel P. Dailey, Reg. No. 54,054 Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE 524 SOUTH MAIN STREET SUITE 200 ANN ARBOR, MI 48104 (734) 302-6000